



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,176	09/14/2000	Toshiyuki Yamashita	325772019400	2043
7590	01/14/2004		EXAMINER	
Barry E. Bretschneider Morrison & Foerster LLP 1650 Tysons Blvd., suite 300 McLean,, VA 22102			CUFF, MICHAEL A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/662,176	YAMASHITA ET AL.
	Examiner Michael Cuff	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 5 recites a cleaning apparatus for cleaning parts and communicating with the management apparatus. The cleaning apparatus is briefly and vaguely described on page 9, lines 5-12. The examiner does not know what the cleaning apparatus is. No new matter may be added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okigami in view of Antziopoulos et al.

Okigami shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying numerous transmitters, where data is stored and specifically monitoring operation value compared to life value.

Okigami shows, figure 1, a networked connected device 5 (terminal apparatus, copier) with storage section 11 (first memory), a communications section (controller, see figure 2b), and a network connection. There is a trouble management server 2 (management apparatus) with storage section 21 (second memory).

Antziopoulos et al. teaches, figure 1, a copier system with monitors. In order to change these replacement components individually depending on the particular rated service life (life value), each replacement component is associated with its own level-of-use detector (operating value). See column 3, lines 34-36.

Based on the teaching of Antziopoulos et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Okigami system to specifically monitor operation value compared to life value in order to change these replacement components individually.

The examiner takes Official Notice that multiple transmitters can take the place of network connections in order to provide a cheaper and more simple means of data transfer and that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store data in any one of a number of database in order to provide more convenience.

Based on the discussion above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Okigami system to replace the network connections with multiple transmitters in order to provide a cheaper

and more simple means of data transfer and to store data in any database in order to provide more convenience.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts the cleaning apparatus is adequately described in the specification and recites, "The examiner may also note that the claim is directed to a method, not to the physical apparatus itself." The examiner does not concur. Applicant's specification citations do not describe the cleaning apparatus. The cleaning apparatus is just vaguely mentioned, not described. For example, page 40, line 9, "the format transmitted from the cleaning apparatus ..." and page 51, "the part ID transmitted from the cleaning apparatus is loaded." There is no description of what the cleaning apparatus is. As for applicant's assertion that the claim is directed to a method, the examiner suggest applicant re-read claim 5. It is an apparatus claim and does recite "a cleaning apparatus for cleaning parts, ..."

Applicant asserts that the references do not show a means for monitoring the actual life of a part, includes information concerning the entire life of the part, and a quote from the summary of the invention. These assertions are not relevant because the argued issues are not in the claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0610. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Michael Cuff 1/12/04
Michael Cuff
January 12, 2004